DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 680 EA 024 290

AUTHOR	Reyes, Pedro
TITLE	Preliminary Models of Teacher Organizational Commitment: Implications for Restructuring the Workplace.
INSTITUTION	Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, Madison, WI.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	May 92
CONTRACT	R117Q0005-92
NOTE	40p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Models; *Predictor Variables; School Effectiveness; *School Organization; School Restructuring; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching Conditions
IDENTIFIERS	*Organizational Commitment

ABSTRACT

Based on a review of recent research on school effects and workplace psychology, this paper hypothesizes that three core concepts comprise teacher organizational commitment: (1) belief in school goals and student learning ability; (2) intention to remain an active member of the school; and (3) willingness to exert extra effort on the school's behalf. The academic literature and national reports assume that many public school teachers commitment to the proper means and ends of education. Since little is actually known on the subject, the study summarized in this paper develops and empirically tests an index of teacher organizational commitment and examines the organizational conditions, processes, and individual features affecting it. The study uses the High School and Beyond database derived from a nationally drawn stratified probability sample of 1,032 high schools; core data were gathered from the 1984 Administrator and Teacher Survey. Overall, the analysis suggests that organizational support, collaboration climate, school orderly environment, encouragement for innovation, shared decision making, and frequency of supervision directly affect teacher commitment. The most powerful predictors of teacher organizational commitment are teachers' motivation to learn and sense of efficacy. Women tend to have higher school commitment than males. Also, years of experience correlate negatively with organizational commitment. (Contains 83 references.) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
√ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F Newmann
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED349680

PRELIMINARY MODELS OF TEACHER ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: IMPLICATIONS FOR RESTRUCTURING THE WORKPLACE

Pedro Reyes
The University of Texas At Austin

May 1992

Final Deliverable to OERI

Acknowledgements:

This paper was prepared for the National Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, supported by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Grant No.R117Q0005-92) and By the Wisconsin Center for Education Research, School of Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison and also by a grant from The National Academy of Education Spencer Fellowship. The author wishes to acknowledge the extensive comments, criticisms, and support of Fred Newmann during the design and conduct of the research. I also thank Bill Firestone and Brian Rowan for thoughtful critiques and editorial suggestions on an early draft of this report. Only the author, however, is responsible for any errors of fact or logic which remain.

EA 024 290

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

A growing body of research indicates that the organization of schools affects teachers' worklife and personal dispositions and thus may affect how students learn and perform. In particular, we know that shared decision making has emerged as an organizational process that benefits the work of both teachers and students. Teachers involved in shared decision making seem to be engaged in peer collaboration, team teaching, and involved in shared teaching goals. Teachers also are committed to student learning (Rosenholtz, 1989; Smylie, 1990) and students seem to achieve at higher levels (Rosenholtz, 1989). Furthermore, we know that teachers' individual predispositions affect their performance in the classroom and thus may affect student outcomes (Ashton & Webb, 1986). Qualitative studies also have suggested that certain work structures and individual psychological predispositions have positive effects on teachers and subsequent student learning (Hart, 1991; Lightfoot, 1984; Louis & Smith, 1990; Metz, 1986).

To date, there has been few detailed analysis of the work structures that affect teachers' organizational commitment (Firestone, 1991; Firestone & Rosenblum, 1988; and Rosenholtz, 1989); however, no systematic investigation of individual attributes that precede commitment across a large sample of schools. This study uses the High School and Beyond data to develop a measure of teacher organizational commitment (TOC) and to examine the effects of selected contextual features on teacher organizational commitment.

Based on a review of recent research on school effects and the general theoretical literature on the workplace psychology, we argue that three core concepts comprise Teacher Organizational Commitment: 1) a belief in the goals of the school, about what students should learn and be able to do as they become productive members of society; 2) an intention to remain an active member of the school; and 3) a willingness to exert extra effort that goes beyond personal interest on behalf of the school. Moreover, we argue that these three characteristics of individual teachers, when combined, create a powerful effect on other teachers and students in the school by influencing them to perform at optimal levels.

TEACHER ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: BACKGROUND

Recent reform documents have called for the complete restructuring of schools claiming that the current organization and level of teacher training are inadequate for preparing students for the world of work (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; National Commission on Excellence, 1983). These reports not only affirm that schools have inadequately trained teachers and cumbersome organizational structures, but they also maintain that teachers lack enthusiasm, dedication to their own craft and loyalty to the workplace. This lack of enthusiasm, loyalty and involvement with students is likely to lead to poor performance, low levels of engagement with the goals of the school, and lack of effort. In short, many teachers are not committed to the school and do not work hard

enough. This, in turn, has a negative effect on students' academic performance, their engagement in learning activities, and their intention to remain in school (Rosenholtz, 1989; Wehlage, Rutter, Smith, Lesko, & Fernandez, 1989).

Although the literature on teacher organizational commitment is limited, several studies focus on a variety of problems associated with teacher lack of enthusiasm, dedication, and commitment to the school. Thus, some studies noted here only touch on the notion of teacher commitment as proposed in this study. For instance, Reyes and Pounder (1992) indicate that public school teachers differ significantly in their level of commitment when compared with teachers from private schools--public school teachers having lower levels. Bryk & Driscoll (1988b) argue that private school teachers have higher levels of satisfaction and commitment than public school teachers. Boyer (1983) claims that teacher discouragement about their lack of status, bureaucratic pressures on them, and their ability to gain rewards and recognition result in teachers not exhibiting a "high level of professional competence in their work" (pg. 161). He further argues that "we cannot expect students to shine unless we brighten the prospects for teachers" (pg. 185).

Sizer (1984) describes uncommitted high school teachers through a teacher, Horace, who plods through his day, meaning well but forced to scatter his energy and efforts across a variety of activities which demand his attention. As a result, his teaching is dull, cursory and not particularly important to him or to most of his students. Powell, Farrar, and Cohen (1985) contend that most school adult-student interactions, including most classroom teaching, is characterized by little teacher push, personalization or purpose. As a result, they claim that most students are not engaged in learning, but rather drift through high schools aimlessly. Furthermore, McNeil (1988) presents a detailed and unhappy picture of teachers delivering superficial knowledge and lifeless educational performances which seem unreal to their students. More recently, Rosenholtz (1987) contends that teachers' lowered commitment (as a response to state-mandated reforms) is associated with a lowered sense of teacher efficacy (see also Ashton & Webb, 1986), lowered morale, and leaving teaching either physically or mentally.

The list of factors associated with the reduction of teacher organizational commitment is long and growing. These factors include inadequate incentives to attract and retain teachers in teaching (Darling-Hammond, 1984; Freedman, Jackson, & Boles, 1983), school conditions such as isolation from other teachers and administrators (Lortie, 1975; Sykes, 1984), excessive standardization and technical prescription from attempts to reform schools (Rosenholtz, 1985, 1987), or inadequate educational direction and focus in the school (Corcoran, 1985); and school structures such as scheduling that scatters the time resources of teachers and encourages impersonality, lack of purpose, lack of sense of community, discipline, and effort (Coleman & Hoffer, 1987; Coleman, Hoffer, & Kilgore, 1982; Powell et al., 1985).

In summary, the academic literature as well as the national reports assume that many public school teachers lack enough commitment to the proper ends and means of education.

Yet, commitment is often undefined or implicitly defined as a state as if that state were a well understood. However, whether teachers lack sufficient commitment to their schools, their daily work, or to their careers is unknown. Similarly, the likely causes and results of teachers commitment are unknown or unclear. Though teaching is tied to an organization (Bidwell, 1965; Dreeben, 1973; Lortie, 1975; Reyes, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1987) we know little about how schools as organizations influence the commitment of teachers. Rosenholtz, (1989) maintains that selected aspects of schools such as amount of paper work required might influence teacher organizational commitment. Others assert that commitment is influenced by work structures and roles within an organization (Reyes & Shin, 1992; Rowan, 1990). It is clear that commitment is a complex phenomenon and therefore what influences it and what might result from it are just as complex. Consequently, this study provides a further analysis on teacher organizational commitment and its correlates.

Thus, the major purposes of the study are to develop and empirically test an index of teacher organizational commitment and to examine the organizational conditions, processes and individual features that affect it. Although the two aims of the study are conceptually and empirically different, the purposes are deeply interrelated. Should the measure prove to be a valid predictor of teachers' selected behavior at schools, then theoretical and practical claims about the usefulness of teacher commitment as a concept should be tested and refined in later research using such an index. Also, we propose a series of related hypotheses involving the TOC construct. In doing so, we rely on human resource theory and the general literature on the workplace psychology of schools. The hypotheses include two types: organizational processes that seem to promote and sustain teacher organizational commitment and individual predictors of it. The analyses of both types of predictors provide information on the theoretical significance of teacher commitment by providing information on the most powerful variables linked to it and thus producing significant theoretical information. Moreover, the analyses reinforce the validity of the construct of teacher commitment by showing the strength of relationship among similar variables.

Conceptual Approach and Hypotheses

The conceptual approach used here is based on two lines of thinking. The first theoretical perspective is Human Resource Theory which is based on the works of Argyris (1970), McGregor (1960), and McClelland, (1978) who raised theoretical propositions about the effects of the organizational conditions and processes on employees. McGregor and McClelland, and Argyris theorized that organizations and humans need each other; and that in order to capitalize on human talent, the organization must develop processes and conditions which lead to meaningful and satisfactory work. Following this line of thinking, we hypothesize that certain organizational processes and conditions of schools facilitate the formation of teacher organizational commitment and help sustain it. The organizational conditions include: administrative support, collaboration climate, orderly school environment, encouragement of innovation, union-management climate, among others. Among the organizational processes include: shared decision making, supervision activity, professional

development activity, and the principal's leadership strategies to facilitate the work of teachers. These organizational conditions and processes of schools also have been suggested by other scholars as potential predictors of teacher organizational commitment (see Goodlad, 1984; Lieberman & Miller, 1984; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Reyes, 1990; Reyes, 1992; Rosenholtz, 1989; Rowan, 1990).

The second theoretical perspective comes from the general literature on work psychology that argues that the individual's predispositions have a great deal to do with how teachers behave at the workplace (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Reyes, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989). We hypothesize that some psychological dispositions affect teacher organizational commitment. These include: teacher efficacy, motivation to learn, social interaction, sense of control, locus of control (see Ashton & Webb, 1986; Little, 1987; Little & Bird, 1982; Lortie, 1975; Mclaughlin et al., 1986; Newmann, Rutter, & Smith, 1989; Reyes, 1990; Reyes & Pounder, 1992; Rosenholtz 1985, 1987, 1989). The literature also has argued that some individual attributes precede organizational commitment. Thus, we consider individual attributes such as gender, race, years of experience, and education level as predictors of organizational commitment (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Moreover, Bacharach, Bamber, and Mitchell (1991) argues some work condition variables correlate with commitment. Consequently, we include salary, workload, and tenure as predictors of teacher commitment (Aranya, Kushnir, & Valency, 1986). These organizational and individual variables have been linked with organizational commitment in isolated studies; however, no comprehensive study has analyzed this group of variables in toto, and thus understand their predictive power concerning teacher organizational commitment. Consequently, this study provides such a comprehensive analysis

METHOD

The Data Base and Analytic Sample

This study uses the High School and Beyond data base which comes from a nationally drawn stratified probability sample of 1032 high schools (for fuller description of HS&B see Jones, Knight, and Ingels, 1985). The core data for the current analyses are the teacher and principal questionnaires from the Administrator and Teacher Survey (ATS) collected in 1984 (Moles, 1988). The ATS is a sub-sample of 457 schools form the original HS&B sample. This data base contains information on attitudes of teachers and administrators, expectations for student achievement and behavior, and school personnel on school policy, goals, and work conditions.

The ATS data base has both advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, the researcher is restricted to use proxy measures based on the questions available in the survey. For example, the TOC subcomponent of "intention to stay" was measured indirectly because no items were available to assess such a question directly as in the other components of TOC. On the other hand, the ATS survey offers a large nationally representative sample of

schools. This ATS feature facilitates analyses of organizational effects difficult to attain in qualitative studies.

To insure greater accuracy in analysis, several data filters were used to select the final analytical sample. Missing data on some schools and small within-school samples in others reduced the analytic sample to 382 regular public high schools nationwide. Moreover, schools in which less than 20 teachers responded to the ATS survey were also deleted. Furthermore, we eliminated schools where the majority of the faculty were hired within the last two years. The reason being that it takes time to develop a sense a commitment to the organization. Thus, the school sample size was further reduced to 302 high schools. In all, a sub-sample of about 8000 secondary school teachers comprise the analytic sample used in this study, unless otherwise specified. Variations in sample size between analyses reflect case deletions resulting from the conventions designed to handle missing data.

Psychometric Properties of TOC

In order to operationalize the construct of teacher organizational commitment, we created indicators of the three components assumed to measure TOC: belief in the goals of the school, intention to remain a member of the institution, and exerting extra effort that goes beyond official demands on behalf of the institution (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982; Reyes, 1990). Overall, 34 items from the 1984 HS&B Supplemental Teacher survey were selected as possible indicators of the three core components of TOC. Most of these 34 items were measured on the same scale; otherwise, they were standardized. These 34 items were used as preliminary indicators of teacher organizational commitment.

A content analysis of the 34 items was undertaken to make sure the items related to the theoretical definition of teacher organizational commitment (for more on procedure see Kerlinger, 1987). After several item analyses, twenty items did not fit the theoretical definition of TOC and were discarded. Then, a total of 14 items were submitted to a factor analysis procedure that yielded three sub-factors measuring teacher organizational commitment including only 10 items (see Exhibit 1). Each item correlated at least .45 with the overall index of teacher commitment. Furthermore, the TOC overall index was moderately correlated with the variable of teacher motivation to learn (r=.48) which indicates construct validity (see correlations with other similar variables in Table 2 and 5).

The outcome of the factor analysis, however, reveals that one of the sub-components of TOC was difficult to operationalize given the available survey items (see Exhibit 1). The first four items represent the TOC component of "extra effort"; while the next three depict the component "school goal consensus". Finally, the last three items illustrate the component of "intention to remain a member of the school". However, there were no available items to assess directly such a component. Thus, we decided to measure "intention to stay" indirectly using items that depicted a sense of community among teachers. Research indicates that teachers who feel belong to a community are more likely to remain in such an organization (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988a). The rest of the items were discarded.

Finally to assess the reliability of the combined TOC index, two procedures were used. First, the data were grouped by school and analyzed for consistency across schools; we used the school mean on every item as the raw score; all items of TOC were treated in the same way for each school. Thus, we have over 300 scores used to calculate the internal consistency of the measure at the school level. Second the data were analyzed for reliability at the individual level where the individual was the unit of analysis. In both analyses the combined TOC index shows high levels of consistency (r=.86 and .89 respectively). Thus, the instrument appears robust across schools and individuals.

INSERT EXHIBIT 1 HERE

Measures of Organizational Conditions and Processes

Much has been written in the literature that supports the hypotheses that shared decision making, collaboration, and principal leadership strategies as well as other variables promote teacher motivation, effort, and morale (Little, 1982; Louis, 1991; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988; Reyes, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1985). Furthermore, research and other reports assume that the organizational processes and conditions of schools can be modified to revive the interest and commitment of teachers (Louis & Smith, 1990). Thus, the organizational processes and conditions of interest in this study included frequency of supervisory activity, orderly school environment, administrative support, shared decision making, collaboration climate, encouragement of innovation, principal leadership strategies to facilitate teachers' work, and union-management climate. Discussions of these variables have been central to the literature on restructuring (see Appendix A for specific items and reliability information).

Similarly, the education literature supports the hypotheses that individual predispositions affect teacher behavior at the workplace (Little, 1990, Reyes & Pounder, 1992, Reyes, 1990; Louis, 1991). Furthermore, the literature in work psychology supports the hypotheses that the psychological predispositions predict affective outcomes such as teacher organizational commitment (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Newmann et al., 1989; Reyes, 1990; Rosenholtz, 1989). Consequently, this study considered the following psychological dispositions: teacher sense of efficacy, sense of control, social interaction, locus of control, motivation to learn, and involvement with students. We also considered attributes of individuals such as gender, race, experience, level of education. Finally, we included two variables associated with working conditions. The selection of the items were followed after other national studies for both the organizational and individual variables. However, further psychometric analyses were done on all items to make sure of their consistency and validity (see Appendix A).

Analytical Approach

The purpose of this paper is to generate preliminary models that explain teacher organizational commitment, thus a series of ordinary least square regressions were estimated.

The dependent variable (TOC) was measured and analyzed at the individual level for the overall regression analyses. That is, there was no consideration for the within-school variation at this stage of the analysis. Given this limitation, then I proceeded to regress the hypothesized organizational and individual features assumed to influence teacher organizational commitment. Three regression equations were generated; two models assessed the effects of organizational and individual variables; the other equation integrated both individual and organizational as an overall model.

FINDINGS

Overall, the analysis on the organizational model suggests that organizational support, collaboration climate, school orderly environment, encouragement for innovation, shared decision making, and frequency of supervision have direct effects on teacher organizational commitment. This model explained about 60 percent of the variability in teacher organizational commitment. Furthermore, among the individual variables motivation to learn, teacher efficacy, teacher social interaction, and teacher's sense of control explain about 45 percent of the variability in teacher organizational commitment. Other variables included in the analysis were parental involvement in school, teacher perceptions of student attitudes and work habits, and union-management climate. These variables, albeit weakly, also explained some of the variability in teacher organizational commitment.

Table 1 presents the means and standard deviations concerning the organizational variables used in this study. The correlation matrix among the variables is presented in Table 2 which reveals that multicollinearity is not a problem in this study. Most intercorrelations are low except where expected. For example, the intercorrelations between leadership and organizational support, collaboration, shared decision making, and school orderly environment are moderate. These correlations are expected; the literature has shown that effective leadership is associated with such variables (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Murphy, Weil, Hallinger, & Mitman, 1985; Peterson, 1987; Peterson & Martin, 1990).

INSERT TABLES 1 & 2 HERE

Table 3 shows the regression coefficients of effects on teacher organizational commitment. Out of the organizational processes variables, collaboration climate has the largest effect on teacher organizational commitment (beta=.33). Thirty six percent of the variability in teacher commitment was uniquely explained by high levels of organizational collaboration. High levels of organizational collaboration promotes high levels of teacher organizational commitment. This should come as no surprise since the literature has indicated that a high levels of teacher collaboration has been associated with high levels of teacher engagement (Louis & Smith, 1990) and healthy school organizations (Hoy, Tarter, & Bliss, 1990). Moreover, it has been argued that peer support makes an important

contribution to teacher's sense of efficacy (Ashton & Webb, 1986) and to teacher's job satisfaction (Hoy et al., 1990; Miskel & Ogawa, 1988; Rosenholtz, 1989).

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

As indicated in this table, the second most powerful predictor of teacher organizational commitment is organizational support (Beta=.28). An additional 14 percent of the variability in teacher commitment was explained by the variable of organizational support. Previous literature supports the relationship between level of organizational commitment and organizational support (McLaughlin, Pfeifer, Swanson-Owens, & Yee, 1986; Rosenholtz, 1985, 1989). It is clear that high levels of administrative support for teachers and the availability of teaching materials help promote high levels of teacher organizational commitment. Furthermore, it is obvious that as the principal and administrative staff act as a buffer, sheltering teachers from outside disturbances helps greatly to promote organizational commitment.

Another variable that directly affects teacher organizational commitment is that of orderly school environment (beta=.14). This variable explains an additional three percent of the variance in teacher organizational commitment. As with organizational climate, this variable was expected to affect teacher organizational commitment. It is apparent that where schools have fewer discipline problems and disruptions such as student tardiness, class cutting, and other interruptions, teachers experience high levels of organizational commitment. The literature on school effectiveness has indicted that schools experiencing discipline problems are associated with faculties experiencing low morale and low student achievement (Lieberman & Miller, 1984; Rosenholtz, 1989). Furthermore, a favorable climate seems to promote norms for experimentation (Little, 1987).

Similarly, teacher commitment to school is influenced by the degree of innovation encouraged at the school level (beta=.10). The effect of this variable is somewhat small; however, such effect is statistically significant. To encourage innovation is to encourage teachers to use their expertise and professional judgement to try new and different ideas in the classroom. Teachers feel a sense of control over the events that take place in the classroom and thus feel responsible for the success or failure of the experiment. It could be argued that teachers benefit from either success and failure; failure or success would provide additional information to improve teaching In this study, it is apparent that encouragement of innovation is associated with high levels of teacher organizational commitment.

As with the effect of degree of innovation, the effect of the variable shared decision making on teacher organizational commitment is small. However, organizational commitment also is positively associated with shared decision making (beta=.07). Shared decision making meant being involved with all critical decisions at the classroom level and any decisions relating to student learning. Although the beta weight is not as large as with other variables, this finding indicates that when teachers are involved in critical decisions their level of

organizational commitment increases. Much of the literature has discussed the importance of empowering teachers (Lieberman & Miller, 1984; McLaughlin et al., 1986; Rosenholtz, 1989). Shared decision making is a form of empowerment which enhances the commitment of teachers towards the goals of the school.

Although its effect is small, teacher organizational commitment is affected by the frequency of supervisory behavior at the building level (beta=.05). That is, the frequency of principal's supervision of teaching explains some of the variance in teacher commitment to the goals of the school. It is clear that the more attention principals pay to teachers the more teachers develop commitment to the organization. This finding is not incongruent with the literature concerning effective schools. Principals in effective schools provide direction for goal consensus, treat teachers as partners, monitor the progress of students, and provide professional advice on the most effective tools of teaching (Bossert, Rowan, & Dweyer, 1983; Hallinger and Murphy, 1986; Peterson & Martin, 1990).

The variables of principal leadership, professional development activities, and teacher perceptions of student academic achievement did not enter in any of the regression equations. This reinforces the previous literature which stated that principal leadership does not affect directly what teachers do (Hallinger & Richardson, 1988). As suggested in this paper, the principal has an indirect effect on teacher behavior through organizational processes.

Aside from these organization processes variables, the study included three other variables that intervene at the organizational level, but are not necessarily organizational variables. These variables have an indirect effect on how teachers perform at school. These include the level of parental involvement in school matters, teachers' perceptions of student attitudes and work habits, and the level of union-administration cooperation as perceived by teachers. This study indicates that the variable of parental involvement with school matters affects the level of teacher commitment to the school (beta=.07). The effect of parental involvement on teacher commitment is small; however, it is apparent that the higher teacher-parent interaction about student performance the higher the level of teacher organizational commitment.

Teachers not only pay attention to the level of parental interaction, but also to the students they have in the classroom. Teachers mold their own opinions about student abilities and work habits and such opinions affect deeply the way teachers conduct the classroom (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Rosenholtz, 1985). Thus, the variable of teachers' perceptions of student attitudes and work habits has a powerful effect on teachers' efforts in the classroom. This study indicates that a positive teacher perception of students' attitudes about school and work habits promotes teacher organizational commitment (beta=.0268).

Finally, this study also considered the union-management climate as a facilitator of teacher organizational commitment. The literature has suggested that a positive union-management climate creates an environment in which workers are satisfied and produce at

high levels (Bacharach, Conley, & Shedd, 1986; Lawler, 1986). This assumption was partly supported in this study. On the average, schools that have a positive union-management environment have faculties who are more committed to the school as an organization (beta=.05) than those schools that have a negative environment.

The second model tested in this study included individual variables associated with organizational commitment. Overall, the model explained nearly 45 percent of the variance in teacher organizational commitment. Tables 4 and 5 present the descriptive statistics relating to those variables and the intercorrelation matrix among variables. The intercorrelations among the variables are fairly small except where expected (e.g., years of experience and salary); thus there are no reasons to suspect multicollinearity.

INSERT TABLES 4 & 5 ABOUT HERE

The most powerful variable that explained teacher organizational commitment was teachers' motivation to learn. When teachers have a continuous desire to learn and seek new ideas, teachers have a deeper sense of commitment to the school than teachers who are not motivated to learn (beta=.37). Twenty-three percent of the variance in teacher organizational commitment is explained only by the variable motivation to learn. This finding is supported in the academic literature. Rosenholtz, (1989), Metz, (1986), and Louis and Smith (1990) reported that engaged teachers spend a great deal of their professional time searching for new ideas and learning new techniques to implement in the classroom. This motivation to learn covaries with organizational commitment; highly motivated individuals are likely to display high levels of engagement in activities that go well beyond expectations of a job.

INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

As with the variable of motivation to learn, teacher efficacy and satisfaction was a powerful predictor of teacher organizational commitment (beta=.32). This variable contributed an additional 14 percent in explaining teacher commitment. It is evident that when teachers feel successful in the classroom they also have high levels of organizational commitment. This finding is consistent with the literature on teacher efficacy; when teachers experience a sense of accomplishment and feel good about themselves in the classroom, they also seem to work hard in the classroom and be engaged with students and student learning Ashton & Webb, 1986; Newmann et al., 1989; Rosenholtz, 1989; Smylie, 1990).

Although its effect was small, teacher social interaction also predicted teacher organizational commitment (beta=.15). It is apparent that the more teachers are involved

in school social activities the more they feel a sense of commitment to the school. This finding has been supported in the effective schools literature. Schools that have a communal type of culture seem to be more effective than those that do not have such a culture (Bryk & Thum, 1989; Peterson & Martin, 1990).

Teacher social interaction enhanced teacher organizational commitment; in this study teachers' sense of control produced a similar small effect on teacher commitment to the school (beta=.08). Teachers who have input in critical decisions concerning school policy, curriculum, student learning, and hiring personnel display high levels of organizational commitment. This finding is supported by the literature on teacher empowerment (Lieberman & Miller, 1984; Rosenholtz, 1985, 1989). This literature indicates that empowered teachers develop ownership of work and thus take responsibility for classroom outcomes.

Gender also influenced the levels of teacher organizational commitment (beta=.08). Although the gender effect in predicting teacher commitment is small, women exhibited higher levels of commitment to the school then men. Previous research supports this finding (Biklen, 1985; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982; Reyes, 1989; Rosenholtz, 1989). Women's higher level of organizational commitment has been attributed to two factors; women seem to define careers differently than man and women derive greater satisfaction from teaching than males do (Biklen, 1985).

Teacher workload also predicted organizational commitment. In this study, we found a small negative relationship between the number of hours assigned to teachers and their level of organizational commitment. It is apparent that the higher the number of extra hours assigned the lower the level of teacher commitment to the school (beta=.-.05). This finding has been supported in the literature concerning workload; teachers who perceive their workload as unfair display lower levels of commitment, morale, and satisfaction than those who perceive their workload as fair (Reyes & Imber, 1992).

Teacher involvement with student concerns influences teacher organizational commitment as well. In this study, it is clear that the more teachers avoided student concerns the lower the levels of organizational commitment (beta=-.05). This finding is expected. The effective schools literature argues that committed teachers maintain themselves engaged in classroom and student-related concerns (Brookover, Brady, & Warfield 1981; Edmonds, 1979; Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982).

The literature on teacher tenure and employee affective behaviors indicates that tenure is a predictor of employee commitment (Mowday, Porter, & Steers 1982; Reyes, 1989, 1990). In this study, tenure also was a predictor of teacher organizational commitment (beta=.04). Although the beta coefficient is small, it indicates that lack of tenure is correlated with teacher organizational commitment (the question was coded as 1=tenure and 2=no tenure or not offered). This finding contradicts the current literature which specifies the opposite (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982).

Lastly, teacher locus of control also predicted teacher organizational commitment. In this study, externals those who blame their lack of success to external factors, have lower levels of organizational commitment. Conversely, those teachers who believe that they can control success or failure have high levels of commitment (beta= -.04). Although the effect of locus of control is small, the literature in this area is clear in that individuals who are internals have high levels of need for achievement (McClelland, 1978, 1985).

Finally, the integrative model explained 62 percent of the variance in teacher commitment (See table 7). All the variables presented in both the organizational and individual models were picked up in the integrative model; two extra variables were added to the integrative model: total years of experience and salary. Total years of experience correlates negatively with organizational commitment (beta= -.04)--- the more years of experience the lower levels of organizational commitment. This is an unexpected finding since most of the literature in this area has concluded that a positive relationship exists between years of experience and organizational commitment (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982).

The second significant variable in the integrative model is that of salary. A small but positive relationship exists between levels of salary and levels of organizational commitment (beta=.06)--- the higher the salary the higher the organizational commitment. This finding is somewhat contradictory to current perceptions of public school teachers who have been perceived not to be interested in salary issues and more concerned with altruism (See Tyack, 1982). However, the management literature has posed that salary is an important variable in predicting employee attitudes (Lawler, 1986; Bacharach, Conley, & Shedd 1989). This study shows also that teachers pay attention to salary issues and that salary drives to some extent their behavior and attitudes in schools.

INSERT TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

DISCUSSION

This article began with a summary of research suggesting that the concept of teacher organizational commitment has not been thoroughly studied within the context of educational organizations. It was posited that developmental work was needed to understand the theoretical nature of the concept and its possible applications in efforts to restructuring schools. The article then investigated conditions that promote or impede teacher organizational commitment in American high schools. This analysis was accomplished by developing three models that incorporated variables assumed to explain teacher organizational commitment.

A measure of teacher organizational commitment was developed using teacher perceptions and behaviors gathered from the ATS data set. One of the most important

findings of the study was that this measure, despite the within-school variability, displayed its robustness at the individual-level. The psychometric analysis showed that TOC was quite reliable. On the other hand, this robustness may be due to the large sample used in the study.

At the same time, the analysis on the organizational processes and conditions that predict commitment raised interesting theoretical questions that were pursued in the study. Several propositions developed in the literature were confirmed: the extent to which organizational conditions and processes contribute to variability in teachers' organizational commitment. For example, among the organizational conditions we found a strong relationship among administrative support, collaboration climate, orderly school environment, encouragement of innovation, union-management climate and faculty commitment to the school. These organizational conditions generate high levels of teacher organizational commitment

Organizational Conditions

Among the organizational conditions, collaborative efforts is the most powerful condition that must be present at school to enhance teacher organizational commitment. This study provides a strong argument for increasing collaborative efforts among teachers and teachers and administrators within the school. It is obvious that strong collaborative efforts generate high levels of teacher organizational commitment. The academic literature has indicated that collaboration leads to developing a sense of community and goal consensus among teachers (Little, 1987). Other scholars have speculated that collaboration leads to high levels of employee performance and productivity (Hackman & Walton, 1986). On the other hand, Little (1990) indicated that the collaboration taking place in schools lacks quality. Despite this limitation, this study calls for greater efforts to enhance teacher collaboration at the workplace. Collaboration can only lead to better decision making among teachers; moreover, collaboration can only contribute positively to restructure curriculum and instruction at the school level.

This paper also offers a strong argument for enhancing administrative support for teachers at the workplace as a condition to increase teacher commitment to school. Teachers who see their principal, department chair, or any other administrator involved in improving teaching and instruction, involved in solving problems faced by staff, and in providing necessary materials to support instruction, have high levels of organizational commitment. To put it simply: effective administrators lead the way or let someone else lead in dealing with the issues affecting teachers, and genuinely care about the individual teacher. Effective leaders make a difference and enlist teacher commitment to a course of action (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Ineffective leaders only create obstacles for teachers and truncate the mission of the school. Thus, this study urges the administrator using the old concepts of bureaucratic management to rethink the way schools are run. It is obvious that schools cannot be run as an assembly-line type of organization. Schools are comprised of professionals who need a high degree of autonomy and support to do what is best for children.

Orderly school environment was found to be another organizational condition facilitating teacher organizational commitment. This finding implies teachers have high levels of commitment to the school when student misbehavior, tardiness, and class cutting are absent in schools. The literature has indicated that principals need to pay attention to these matters to support teachers. Consequently, this study is a source of encouragement to principals to develop specific strategies to minimize such student misbehaviors and to develop an environment conducive for learning.

Furthermore, this study suggests that the more teachers are allowed to experiment and innovate in the classroom the more they develop commitment to the school. This finding has been supported repeatedly in the literature which suggests that employees sense of efficacy increases when they are free from bureaucratic organizational constraints. Thus, school principals may consider challenging the status quo in the school by providing ample opportunity for teachers to engage in experimentation and the testing of innovative ideas at the workplace. The principal does not have to be the creator of these ideas; but the principal,at least should recognize, support, and encourage teachers to challenge the system and to experiment with new ideas.

The final organizational condition affecting teacher organizational commitment is the type of union-management climate. Although the effect of this organizational condition is small, it is a finding that has been supported elsewhere. For example, Bacharach, Conley, and Shedd,(1990) and Lawler, (1986) have indicated that effective managers maintain excellent relationships with their labor unions.

Organizational Processes

Among the organizational processes, shared decision making and supervisory activity significantly predicted teacher organizational commitment. On the other hand, professional staff development activities and principal leadership did not.

Shared decision making contributed to explain variability in teacher organizational commitment. However, the magnitude of the beta weight does not provide a strong argument for or against shared decision making. Even though shared decision making has been supported in the literature as a form of school restructuring (The Carnegie Forum, 1986), it is clear from the findings of this study that shared decision making, at least in its present form, does not affect powerfully teacher behavior and attitudes about school. The reasons behind this finding cannot be surmised form the data used herein. Nonetheless, the current version of school shared decision making which tends to limit teachers to an advisory role, may explain such a finding. Moreover, teachers who participate in shared decision making structures, see such participation as an added task to their normal load. Meetings interrupt or take place after teachers finish their teaching assignments and they are not compensated for the extra duties attached to shared decision making. Furthermore, the processes of shared decision making are ill-defined (input, advisory, decisions, etc.) and thus confusion abounds among teachers concerning the parameters or boundaries of their roles

in decision making (Reyes and Wagstaff, 1992). Teachers feel confused and disinterested in an ambiguous structure.

Similarly, the number of staff development activities did not predict teacher organizational commitment. Staff development is an important activity to revitalize the teacher work force if properly implemented. This study suggests the opposite. However, this finding may be explained as follows. Staff development activities are generally designed either with a narrow purpose, or with general purposes with few teachers benefitting from the experience. Such activities are designed without teacher involvement. Thus, the potential value of the staff development activity is lost and teachers rarely benefit from such professional development work.

The finding most surprising here contradicts the conventional thinking about supervision activity. Supervision of teachers has been assumed to be another bureaucratic imposition in which teachers are simply treated as non-professionals. The findings here suggest that supervisory activity is needed to promote teacher commitment. The reasons behind this finding are unclear. However, it could be assumed that as teachers get more attention from the school principal they have a clearer sense of the school mission and thus develop high levels of commitment to the school. More work needs to be done in this area to understand such a finding.

Dispositions, Attributes, and Work Conditions

Concerning the psychological dispositions that predict teacher organizational commitment, several propositions suggested in the literature were ratified: teacher motivation to learn, efficacy, social interaction, sense of control, involvement with students, and locus of control are associated with variability in teacher organizational commitment. Among the individual attributes hypothesized to predict teacher commitment to the school only gender was found to be related to commitment. Moreover, tenure, workload, and salary were the work conditions found to affect teacher commitment to school.

This study shows that the most powerful predictors of teacher organizational commitment are teachers' motivation to learn and sense of efficacy. In general, teachers highly motivated to learn seem to have also high levels of commitment to the school. This finding supports the idea of teacher experimentation. That is, those teachers highly motivated to learn may need more freedom to experiment and innovate in the classroom. It appears also that teachers who feel successful in providing excellent education to all students have high levels of organizational commitment. The reasons behind the findings are not clear; unfortunately, we lack a strong theory to account for these results. Some scholars contend that perceptual differences should be treated as "raters' bias" (James & Jones, 1974). However, it is possible that these differences in teacher motivation to learn, may hinder teachers' ability to pursue collaborative relationships as suggested earlier. If this is the case, then there are important implications for efforts to restructure schools. The results suggest that teachers who are highly motivated to learn, have a high sense of efficacy,

and seem to take an analytical view of their work and are more likely to develop commitment to the school. Thus, the composition of the teacher workforce within a school may affect the extent to which school reform gets implemented and executed.

The analysis demonstrated that teachers' social interaction and involvement with students, and sense of control affect their levels of organizational commitment. These findings are consistent with the literature on school restructuring, which calls for supportive work relationships, participative decision making, and high levels of staff cooperation. It is obvious that teacher involvement in the local culture provides them with a feeling of integration. More importantly, this sense of community makes an important contribution to teachers' sense of efficacy and their sense of control. Thus, reformers may consider staff involvement in the school culture and empowering teachers with critical decision making as tools to accomplish school reform.

Lastly, two other variables contributed to variability in teachers' organizational commitment: teacher perceptions of student academic attitudes and work habits and parent-teacher interaction about student academic performance. The teacher perception variable implies that student engagement in academic work promotes teacher organizational commitment-a finding which has been supported in the literature (Louis & Smith, 1990). Similarly, the variable of parent-teacher interaction indicates that teachers' commitment increases as teachers and parents interact frequently about student academic performance. The reasons behind this finding are not clear; however one may be that teachers see a partnership (between both parents and teachers) which promotes teacher commitment. More research is needed in this area to uncover the effects of parental participation in school and teacher organizational commitment.

Among the individual attributes, gender and years of experience explained teacher organizational commitment variability. The literature has documented that gender has been a predictor of commitment; women are more likely to have higher levels of commitment to the school than males (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). On the other hand, the results from the integrative model indicated that years of experience correlated negatively with organizational commitment. This finding also contradicts the current literature which indicated that a positive relationship exists between the two. It may be that teachers, as the years accumulate and their idealism gets eroded by the school bureaucracy, stop their efforts to innovate and experiment in the classroom and thus develop other interests away from their workplace. If this is the case, then reformers need to develop different strategies to maintain veteran teachers engaged in the school. This suggests that more attention needs to be given in the reform literature to the problems faced by veteran staffs as restructuring takes place at the school level.

Finally, among the work conditions variables workload, tenure, and salary facilitated teacher organizational commitment. Although the effect of these variables is low on teacher commitment, tenure and workload are negatively related to commitment. Teachers lacking tenure are more committed to the school than those tenured. This may be explained by the

fact that teachers who are untenured are commonly beginning a career in education and have high levels of enthusiasm and commitment (Reyes, 1990); while veteran teachers already understand the system and have no expectations to advance as professionals (Lortie, 1975). Similarly, the effect of salary on teacher organizational commitment is minimal. The findings do not offer a strong argument for increasing salaries to enhance teacher commitment to the school. At the same time, the study offers no argument for decreasing salary levels.

CONCLUSION

This article presented preliminary work concerning the organizational processes and individual attributes that predict teacher organizational commitment. We used two levels of analyses concerning both predictors: the organizational group of predictors and individual attributes. Moreover, although we did not measure the within level of variability of teacher organizational commitment as suggested in other studies (Raudenbush & Bryk, 1988; Rowan, Raudenbush, & Kang, 1991), we found that the measure of organizational commitment was quite robust at the aggregate level. But, this high reliability may be due to the large sample employed in this study; thus, more studies are needed to assess the reliability and validity of the teacher organizational commitment measure.

Theoretically, this research has developed a beginning to understand the concept of commitment within the education organization context. More work needs to be developed in this area to have a complete understanding of the theoretical nature of the concept of organizational commitment. For instance, some of the work presented here contradicts the conventional literature in this area; more studies are needed to substantiate those claims. Why total years of experience and tenure are negatively related to teacher organizational commitment? Is it the type organization used as the unity of analysis? Or is it a function of the sample? How is organizational commitment developed in non-for-profit organizations where a labor-intensive and a not-easy to define product is expected? Questions such as those and more need to be pursued in later work.

At another level, this paper presents a strong argument for involving school administrators in the second wave of educational reform. The current literature on professionalization has somewhat ignored the effect of school administrators on teachers and students (see the reforms in Rochester, NY and Chicago, IL where principals serve at the pleasure of local councils). The data presented here illustrates the organizational conditions and processes administrators need to use to enhance teacher organizational commitment. These findings suggest that at least under the current system administrators can do a great deal to improve teacher commitment.

Furthermore, there are some implications for restructuring schools. It is obvious from this data base that high schools cannot be places where a centralized governance structure is present and administrators make all critical decisions. Teachers are highly educated

stakeholders who have every right to be involved in critical decision making, to be involved in determining what is best for their students. High schools need, then, to be reconceptualized as communities of learning where teachers engage in continuous improvement, collaborate with colleagues in every aspect of curriculum and pedagogy, experiment with new ideas without being fearful of punishment from a higher authority. The high school needs to be a place where teachers and children come to learn; a place where teachers and administrators are equals and working towards a common goal--the education of all children.

In summary, we demonstrated that a relationship exists between certain organizational conditions and processes and teacher organizational commitment suggesting that such organizational variables can be manipulated to increase the probability that teachers remain engaged and productive at the workplace. We also noted the importance of school leadership as a critical factor in restructuring schools. Concerning the model, we pointed out that this preliminary work needs to be developed further; nonetheless, we think that the model developed in this effort can be used as a broad plan of action to restructure schools. Given the current problems of student achievement, the lack of excellent teachers, and the changing demographics (Hodgkinson, 1985; Yates & Ortiz, 1991), we cannot afford to ignore the problem of low teacher organizational commitment. In this study, we suggested that several organizational features of schools can be restructured to promote teacher commitment to the proper ends and means of education.

REFERENCES

Aranya, N., Kushnir, T., & Valency, A. (1986). Organizational commitment in a male-dominated profession. Human Relations, 39, 433-448.

Argyris, C. (1970). Intervention theory and method: A behavioral science view. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. (1986). Making a difference. New York: Longman.

Bacharach, S. B., Conley, S., & Shedd, J. (1986). Beyond career ladders: Structuring teacher career development systems. Teachers College Record, 87, 563-574.

Bacharach, S., Bamber, P., & Mitchell, S. (1991). Work design, role conflict, and role ambiguity: The case of elementary and secondary schools. Educational Policy and Evaluation, 12, 415-432.

Barr, R., & Dreeben R. (1983). How schools work. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1977). Federal programs supporting educational change (Vol. 7). Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Bidwell, C. E. (1965). The school as a formal organization. In. J. G. March (Ed.), Handbook of Organizations, (pp. 972-1022). Chicago: Rand.

Biklen, S. K. (1985). Can elementary school teaching be a career?: A search for new ways of understanding women's work. Issues in Education, 3: 215-231.

Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18, 34-64.

Boyer, E. (1983). High School. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Brookover, W., Schweitzer, J., Beady, C., Flood, P., & Wisenbaker, J. (1978). Elementary school social climate and school achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 15, 301-18.

Bryk, A. S., & Driscoll, M. E. (1988a). An empirical investigation of the school as community. Unpublished manuscript, University of Chicago, Department of Education.

Bryk, A. S., & Driscoll, M. E. (1988b). The high school as community: contextual influences, and consequences for students and teachers. Madison: National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.

Bryk, A. S., Lee, V. E., & Smith, J. B. (1989). High school organization and its effects on teachers and students: An interpretative summary of the research. Paper prepared for the Invitational Conference on "Choice and Control in American Education." Madison, Wisconsin.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Bryk, A. S., & Thum. (1989). The effects of high school organization on dropping out: An exploratory investigation. American Educational Research Journal, 26, 353-384.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Report of the task force on teaching as a profession. New York: Carneige Corporation of New York.

Coleman, J. S., Hoffer, T., & Kilgore S. (1982). High school achievement. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Coleman, J. S., & Hoffer T. (1987). Public and private high schools. New York: Basic Books.

Corcoran, T. B. (1985). Effective secondary schools. In R. Kyle (Ed.) Reaching for Excellence: An Effective School Sourcebook, (pp. 71-97). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1984). Beyond the commission reports-the coming crisis in teaching. Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation.

Dreeben, R. (1973). The school as a workplace. In R. M. Travers (Ed.), Second handbook of research in teaching, (pp. 450-473). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Firestone, W. A. (1991). Merit pay and job enlargement as reforms: Incentives, implementation and teacher response. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 13, 269-288.

Firestone, W. A., & Corbet, H. D. (1988). Planned organizational change. In N. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational evaluation, (pp. 321-340). New York: Longman.

Firestone, W. A., & Rosenblum, S. (1988). Building comitment in urban high schools. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10(4), 285-300.

Freedman, S., Jackson, J., & Boles, K. (1983). Teaching: an 'imperiled' profession. In G. Sykes & E. Schulman (Eds.), The handbook of teaching and policy, (pp. 269-299). New York: Longman.

Goodland, J. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw Hill.

Hackman, R., & Walton, R. (1986). Groups under contrasting management strategies. In P. S. Goodman (Ed.), Designing effective work groups. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (1986, May). The social context of effective schools. American Journal of Education, 328-355.

Hallinger, P., & Richardson, D. (1988). Models of shared leadership: Evolving structures and relationships. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Hart, A. W. (1991). Impacts of the school social unit on teacher authority during work redesign. American Educational Research Journal, 27, 503-532.

Hodgkinson, H. L. "Bud" (1985). All in the system: Demographics of education-kindergarten through graduate school. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Hodgkinson, H. L. "Bud" (1987). Changing society: unchanging curriculum. National Forum, LXVII(3), 8-11.

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Bliss, J. R. (1990). Organizational climate, school health, and effectiveness: A comparative analysis. Educational Administration Quarterly, 25(3), 260-279.

James, L. R., & Jones, A. P. (1974). Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. Psychology Bulletin, 81, 1096-1112.

Lawler, E. (1986). High involvement in management. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1984). School improvement: Themes and variations. Teacher's College Record, 86(1), 4-19.

Lieberman, A, & Miller, L. (1978). The social realities of teaching. Teacher's College Record, 80(1), 54-68.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1984). The good high school. New York: Basic Books.

Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of schooling. American Education Research Journal, 19(3), 325-340.

Little, J. W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. Teachers College Record, 91, 509-536.

Little, J. W., & Bird, T. (1987). Instructional leadership close to the classroom. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), Instructional leadership, (118-138). Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Louis, K. S. (1991). Restructuring and teacher engagement: Results from a survey. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Louis, K. S., & Smith, B. (1990). Teacher Working Conditions. In Reyes, P. (Ed.), Teachers and their workplace: Commitment, performance and productivity. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

McClelland, D. C. (1978). Managing motivation to expand human freedom. American Psychologist, 33, 201-210.

McClelland, D. C. (1985). Human Motivation. Glenview, IL: Scott Forsman.

McDill, E. L., Natriello, G., & Pallas, A. M. (1986, February). A population at risk: Potential consequences of tougher school standards for student dropouts. American Journal of Education, 94, 135-181.

McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

McLaughlin, M. W., Pfeifer, R. S., Swanson-Owens, D., & Yee, S. (1986, February). Why teachers won't teach. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 420-425.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

McNeil, L. M. (1988). Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge. New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Metz, M. H. (1986). Different by design. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Miskel, C., & Ogawa, R. (1988). Work motivation, job satisfaction and climate. In N. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of Educational Administration. New York: Longman.

Moles, O. (Ed.). (1988). High school and beyond administrator and teacher survey: Data file user's manual. Washington, DC: OERI, U.S. Department of Education.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). Employee-organization linkages. New York: Academic Press.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (1988). Characteristics of instructional effective school districts. Journal of Educational Research, 81, 175-181.

Murphy, J., Weil, M., Hallinger, P., & Mitman, A. (1985, Spring). School effectiveness: A framework. The Educational Forum, 49, 361-374.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Newmann, F., & Archbald, D. (1990). Organizational performance of schools. In P. Reyes (Ed.), Teachers and their workplace: Commitment performance and productivity. San Francisco, CA: Sage Publications.

Newmann, F. M., Rutter, R. A., & Smith, M. S. (1989, October). Organizational factors that affect school sense of efficacy, community and expectations. Sociology of Education, 62, 221-238.

Peterson, K., & Martin, J. (1990). Commitment and organizational culture. In. P. Reyes (Ed.), Teachers and their workplace: Commitment performance and productivity. San Francisco, CA: Sage Publications.

Powell, A., Farrar, E., & Cohen, D. (1985). The shopping mall high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Raudenbush, S. W., & Bryk, A. S. (1988) Methodological advances in analyzing the effects of schools and classrooms on student learning. In. E. Z. Rothkopf (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, 15. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Reyes, P. (1989). The relationship of autonomy in decision making to commitment to schools and job satisfaction: A comparison between public school teachers and mid-level administrators. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 22(2), 62-69.

Reyes, P. (1990). Teachers and their workplace: Commitment, performance and productivity. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Reyes, P., & Imber, M. (1992). Teachers' perceptions of the fairness workload and their commitment, satisfaction and moral. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 5, 291-302.

Reyes, P., & Pounder, D. (1992). Organizational orientation in public and private schools and teacher outcomes. Journal of Educational Research (in press).

Reyes, P., & Shin, H. (1992). Work redesign and teacher outcomes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Reyes, P., & Wagstaff, L. (1992). Site-based decision making in public schools (Report). Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, Educational and Economic Policy Center.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1985). Effective Schools: interpreting the evidence. American Journal of Education, 93(3), 352-387.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1987, August). Educational reform strategies: will they increase teacher commitment? American Journal of Education, 534-562.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Teacher's workplace. New York: Longman.

Rowan, B. (1990). Commitment and Control: Alternative Strategies for the Organizational Design of Schools. In Cazden, C. (Ed.) Review of Research in Education, vol. 16 Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Rowan, B., Bossart, S. T., & Dwyer, D. C. (1983, April). Research on effective schools: A cautionary note. Educational Researcher, 21-31.

Rowan, B. Raudenbush, S. W., & Kang, S. J. (1991). Organizational design in high schools: A multilevel analysis. American Journal of Education, 99, p. 238-266.

Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Smylie, M. A. (1990). Teacher efficacy. In P. Reyes (Ed.), Teachers and their workplace: Commitment, performance, and productivity. San Francisco, CA: Sage Publications.

Sykes, G. (1984). The conference. A paper presented to the California Roundtable on Educational Opportunity's Symposium on the Teaching Profession, Asilomar, California.

Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Tyack, D., & Hansot, E. (1982). Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820-1980 (pt. 3). New York: Basic.

Wehlage, G., Rutter, R. A., Smith, G. A. Lesko, N., & Fernandez, R. R. (1989). Reducing the risk: Schools as communities of support. London: Falmer Press.

Yates, J. R., & Ortiz, A. A. (1991). Professional development needs of teachers who serve exceptional language minorities in today's schools. Teacher Education and Special Education, 4, p. 11-18.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EXHIBIT 1
FACTOR LOADINGS FOR TOC

		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
T21	Extra hours spent outside class related to school	-.03048	.35442	.47993
T13	Average time per month planning with other teachers	.10567	.01626	.73886
T14	Visits to other teacher classrooms to observe and discuss teaching	.15721	-.22341	.66342
T19C	Conscious effort to coordinate with other teachers	.00316	.30267	.51986
T19E	Most colleagues share beliefs and values	.13683	.74134	.03660
T19V	Feel accepted and respected by colleagues	.22597	.65357	.00662
T19BB	Administrators and teachers agree on policy	.22566	.62420	.01644
T19FF	I look forward to each working day	.76036	.10472	.13505
T19GG	This school seems like a big family	.58621	.35313	.07315
T19II	Sometimes I feel my effort is a waste of time	.76406	-.02514	.09840

Alpha =.8134

APPENDIX A

Independent Variables
(items from 1984 HSB Teacher Questionnaire)

Individual Teacher Variables

Teachers' sex
T37 What is your sex?

Teacher race
T39 What is your race?

Teacher Tenure
T45 Do you have tenure or its equivalent in your school?

Teacher Total Years of Experience
T40 Prior to this year, how many years of experience have you had as a full time teacher?

Teacher Education
T41 What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Teacher Salary
T46 What is your annual salary from your school before taxes?

Efficacy/Satisfaction alpha = .74 (Measured on 4-point scale; 1=not successful; 4=very successful.)

T17 To what extent do you feel successful in providing the kind of education you would like to provide for most of your students?

T32 How much of the time do you feel satisfied with your job in this school?

Sense of Control Over Classroom Practices alpha = .74

T02 How much control do you feel you have in your classroom over each of the following areas of your planning and teaching? (Measured on a 6-point scale; 1=no control; 6=complete control.)

a. Selecting textbooks and other instructional materials.
b. Selecting content, topics, and skills to be taught.
c. Selecting teaching techniques.
d. Disciplining students.
e. Determining the amount of homework to be assigned.

Motivation to Learn
T19X Teachers in this school are continually learning and seeking new ideas. (6-point scale; 1=strongly disagree; 6=strongly agree.)

Internal Locus of Control
T19F My success or failure in teaching students is due primarily to factors beyond my control rather than to my own effort and ability. (6-point scale.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teacher Social Interaction

T12 Since the beginning of the current year, how often have you participated in predominantly faculty social activities (such as potlucks, musical activities, special group efforts to help a colleague)?

(0=Never; 1=1-2 times; 2=3-5 times; 3=6-9 times; 4=10-20 times; 5=more than 20 times.)

Workload alpha = .80

T21A-K In addition to the hours you are assigned to teach, about how many hours outside of class do you spend each week in each of the following activities? (Measured on a 7-point scale; 1=less than 15 hours; 7=more than 30 hours.)

- Hall duty, study hall, lunch room
- Completing forms and administrative paperwork
- Preparing lessons/lectures
- Background reading in subject area
- Contacting employers on students' behalf
- Conducting makeup work for students
- Counseling students
- Coaching
- Directing non-athletic extracurricular activities
- Non-school sponsored activities with students
- Tutoring students

Teacher Involvement with Student Concerns

T19H I try to avoid getting involved in students' personal concerns. (6-point scale; 1=strongly disagree; 6=strongly agree.)

Organizational Variables

Student Academic Attitudes and Work Habits

T19cc The attitudes and habits my students bring to my class greatly reduce their chances for academic success. (6-point scale; 1=strongly disagree; 6=strongly agree.)

Administrative Support alpha = .79

T03 To what extent has each of the following helped you to improve your teaching or solve an instructional or class management problems? (6-point scale; 1=no help; 6=extremely helpful.)

a. Principal or school head.
b. Other school level administrators.
c. Department Chair

T19s This school's administration knows the problems faced by the staff. (6-point scale.)

T19w The school administration's behavior toward the staff is supportive and encouraging.

T19z Necessary materials (e.g., textbooks, supplies, copy machine) are readily available as needed by the staff.

Shared Decision Making alpha = .78

T01 How much influence do teachers have over school policy in each of the areas below? (6-point scale; 1=none; 6=a great deal.)

a. Determining student behavior codes.
b. Determining the content of in-service programs.
c. setting policy on grouping students in classes by ability.
d. Establishing the school curriculum.

T19q Staff are involved in making decisions that affect them. (6-point scale.)

T19y The principal seldom consults with staff members before he/she makes decisions that affect us.

Orderly School Environment alpha = .75 (Measured on a 6-point scale.)

T19G The level of student misbehavior and/or drug or alcohol use in this school interferes with my teaching.

T19p The amount of student tardiness and class cutting in this school interferes with my teaching.

T19A The learning environment in this school is not conducive to school achievement for most students.

T19aa Teachers are expected to help maintain discipline in the entire school, not just their classroom.

Collaboration Climate alpha = .72 (Measured on a 6-point scale.)

T19d You can count on most staff members to help out anywhere, anytime--even though it may not be part of their official assignment.

T19dd. There is a great deal of cooperative effort among staff members.

T19b Staff members in this school generally don't have much school spirit.

Encouragement of Innovation alpha = .70 (Measured on a 6-point scale.)

T19t In this school I am encouraged to experiment with my teaching.

T19jj The principal is interested in innovation and new ideas.

Principal Leadership alpha = .85 (Measured on a 6-point scale.)

T19i The principal does a poor job of getting resources for this school.

T19j The principal deals effectively with pressures from outside the school that might interfere with my teaching.

T19k The principal sets priorities, makes plans, and sees that they are carried out.

T19r The principal knows what kind of school he/she wants and has communicated it to the staff.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

T19hh The principal lets staff members know what is expected of them.

Professional Development Time alpha = .69 (Measured on a 6-point scale; 0=none; 5=5 or more half days.)

T04 Since the beginning of the current school year, how many half-days have you spent in in-service programs that were held for. . .

a. The whole staff together?
b. A smaller group (e.g., as a department, staff in a special program or a group of volunteers)?

Supervisory Activity (Measured on a 6-point scale.)

T15 Since the beginning of the current school year, how many times has the department head or any other supervisor observed your teaching?

(0=Never; 3=3-4 times; 5=10 more more times.)

Related Variables

Parental Concern with Student Achievement (Measured on an 8-point scale.)

T05 Since the beginning of the current school year, how many students' parents (or guardians) have you talked with individually regarding their child's classroom performance?

(1=None; 8=60 more student's parents.)

Union-Management Climate (Measured on a 6-point scale.)

T19LL The teachers' union (or educational association) and the school administration work together work together to improve the achievement of students in this school.

Perception of Student Academic Ability alpha = .62

T09 How would you rate the average academic ability of students when they enter this school? (5-point scale; 1=much above the national norm; 5=much below national norm.)

T10 Percent of students above school average this year. (6-point scale; 1=0-9 percent; 6=90-100 percent.)

T19L Many of the students I teach are not capable of learning the material I am supposed to teach them. (6-point scale.)

TABLE 1 - MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL VARIABLES

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
UNION-MGMT. CLIM.	3.108	1.501
PARENT CONCERN	4.363	1.764
SUPERVISION	2.517	1.259
PER. STUD. AA	3.770	1.559
ORD. SCHOOL ENVIRO.	21.127	4.727
ORG. SUPPORT	26.096	6.902
SHARED D.M.	20.090	6.058
COLLAB. CLIM	11.644	3.291
INNOVATION	7.874	2.506
LEADERSHIP	21.143	5.807
PROF. DEVLOP.	5.398	2.653
STUD ATT HAB	3.109	1.009

TABLE 2 - INTERCLASS CORRELATION MATRIX OF ORGANIZATIONAL VARIABLES

	UNACT	PTCON	SUPV	STAAP	OSENVIR	ORGSPPT	SHAREDM	COLCLIM	INNVT	LEAD	PROFDEV	ACAABIL	CMT
UNACT													
PTCON	.0247 P=.011												
SUPV	.0812 P=.000	.0271 P=.000											
STAALT	-.1422 P=.000	-.0435 P=.000	-.0056 P=.287										
OSENVIR	.2691 P=.000	.0352 P=.000	.0651 P=.000	-.4712 P=.000									
ORGSPPT	.3746 P=.000	.0209 P=.036	.1758 P=.000	-.2084 P=.000	.4278 P=.000								
SHAREDM	.3482 P=.000	.0533 P=.000	.0705 P=.000	-.2648 P=.000	.4264 P=.000	.5392 P=.000							
COLCLIM	.3170 P=.000	.0407 P=.000	.0720 P=.000	-.2109 P=.000	.4116 P=.000	.4247 P=.000	.3539 P=.000						
INNVT	.3619 P=.000	.0163 P=.047	.1099 P=.000	-.1920 P=.000	.3855 P=.000	.5374 P=.000	.4925 P=.000	.3610 P=.000					
LEAD	.3594 P=.000	-.0080 P=.275	.1354 P=.000	-.2111 P=.000	.5060 P=.000	.5992 P=.000	.4986 P=.000	.3774 P=.000	.6158 P=.000				
PROFDEV	.1010 P=.000	.0821 P=.000	.0841 P=.000	-.1158 P=.000	.1550 P=.000	.1598 P=.000	.1756 P=.000	.1450 P=.000	.1331 P=.000	.1368 P=.000			
ACAABIL	-.1035 P=.000	-.0984 P=.000	.0461 P=.000	.3715 P=.000	-.3418 P=.000	-.1339 P=.000	-.2522 P=.000	-.1820 P=.000	-.1251 P=.000	-.1121 P=.000	-.0706 P=.000		
CMT	.3723 P=.000	.1028 P=.000	.1354 P=.000	-.3135 P=.000	.5067 P=.000	.6151 P=.000	.4880 P=.000	.5918 P=.000	.4862 P=.000	.4999 P=.000	.2008 P=.000	.2308 P=.000	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3 - REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS OF EFFECTS ON TEACHER ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Independent Variable	Model = Organizational Variables		
	B	SEB	Beta
COLLAB. CLIMATE	.714988	.0102	.32907*
ADMIN. SUPPORT	.292554	.0113	.28101*
ORDER SCHOOL ENVIRO.	.207938	.0110	.13782*
INNOVATION	.262566	.0111	.09176*
PARENT/CONCERN	.281675	.0088	.06937*
STUD AH HAB	.339147	.0099	.07262*
SHARE D.M.	.078206	.0112	.06522*
UNI-MGMT CLIM	.258978	.0100	.05436*
SUPERVISION	.265756	.0090	.04712*
(Constant)	12.17811	.4943	

Multiple R .75277
R Square .56666
Adjusted R .56595

Analysis of Variance:

	Df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	9	158819.03	17646.55
Residual	5516	121454.55	22.01

F = 801.439 Sig F = .000

*Significant at p<.0001

TABLE 4 - MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR INDIVIDUAL VARIABLES

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
TSEX		
TRACE		
TTENURE	1.377	.677
TTYEXP	9.7807	3.236
TEDUC	5.533	.965
TSALARY	3.950	1.324
TEFFIC	5.980	1.053
TCTRL	25.426	3.676
TWKLOAD	32.576	9.392
TLOCUS OF CONTROL	3.419	1.724
TMOTIV	3.868	1.250
TSOCINTER	2.512	1.119
TINV STUD	2.805	1.386

TABLE 5 - INTERCLASS MATRIX CORRELATION MATRIX OF INDIVIDUAL VARIABLES

	TSEX	TRACE	TTENURE	TTYEXP	TEDUC	TSALARY	TEFFIC	TCTRL	TWKLOAD	TLCSCTRL	TMOTIV	TSOCINT	TINVSTUD	CMT
TSEX														
TRACE	.0484 P=.000													
TTENURE	.0799 P=.000	-.0177 P=.038												
TTYEXP	-.0876 P=.000	-.0012 P=.455	-.2924 P=.000											
TEDUC	-.0675 P=.000	-.0187 P=.046	-.1351 P=.000	.3420 P=.000										
TSALARY	-.2252 P=.000	-.0342 P=.000	-.3881 P=.000	.4780 P=.000	.3802 P=.000									
TEFFIC	.0384 P=.000	-.0304 P=.001	.0271 P=.003	.0324 P=.001	-.0129 P=.097	-.0056 P=.287								
TCTRL	.0450 P=.000	-.0326 P=.001	.0616 P=.000	-.0324 P=.001	-.0493 P=.000	-.0840 P=.000	.3132 P=.000							
TWKLOAD	-.287 P=.003	.0879 P=.000	.0388 P=.000	-.0459 P=.000	.0082 P=.212	-.0266 P=.005	.0459 P=.000	-.0200 P=.027						
TLCSCTRL	.0621 P=.000	.0730 P=.000	-.0821 P=.000	.0219 P=.018	.0132 P=.091	.0207 P=.019	-.2649 P=.000	-.1998 P=.000	.0059 P=.283					
TMOTIV	.0447 P=.000	.0448 P=.000	.0474 P=.000	.0635 P=.000	-.0627 P=.000	-.0317 P=.001	.2207 P=.000	.1323 P=.000	.0355 P=.000	-.0323 P=.001				
TSOCINT	-.0232 P=.002	-.0289 P=.003	.0326 P=.000	-.0139 P=.092	-.0354 P=.000	-.0747 P=.000	.1293 P=.000	.0979 P=.000	.1881 P=.000	-.0578 P=.000	.1224 P=.000			
TINVSTUD	-.0501 P=.000	.0062 P=.267	-.0529 P=.000	.0592 P=.000	-.0022 P=.411	.0316 P=.001	-.1022 P=.000	-.0883 P=.000	-.1107 P=.000	.1021 P=.000	-.0222 P=.013	-.0902 P=.000		
CMT	.1029 P=.000	-.0096 P=.172	.1100 P=.000	- .0043 P=.346	-.0277 P=.000	-.0576 P=.000	.4631 P=.003	.2786 P=.000	.0929 P=.000	-.1626 P=.000	.4844 P=.000	.2513 P=.000	-.1255 P=.000	

TABLE 6 - REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS OF EFFECTS ON TEACHER ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Independent Variable	Model = Individual Variables		
	B	SEB	Beta
TMOTIVLEARN	2.1670	.0091	.37456*
TEFFICACY	2.2295	.0097	.32445*
TSOCINT	.9187	.0090	.15083*
TSENSE OF CONTROL	.1635	.0094	.08190*
TSEX	1.0492	.0089	.07326*
TWORK LOAD	-.3005	.0088	-.05943*
TINVOL W STUD	-.2756	.0089	-.05324*
TTENURE	.4940	.0089	.04755*
TLOCUS OF CTRL	-.1717	.0093	-.04137*

Multiple R .65239
R Square .42562
Adjusted R .42484

Analysis of Variance:

	Df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	10	159671.46	15967.14
Residual	7388	215482.43	29.16

F = 547.44 Sig F = .0000

*Significant at p<.005

TABLE 7 - REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS OF EFFECTS ON TEACHER ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Independent Variable	Mixed Model = Individual & Organizational Variables		
	B	SEB	Beta
COLLAB. CLIM	.6149	.0118	.28275*
ADMIN. SUPPORT	.2689	.0126	.25857*
EFFICACY	1.4332	.0106	.21096*
MOTIVLEARN	.6772	.0117	.11684*
TSOCINT	.4903	.0009	.08350*
ORDER SCHOOL ENVIRO	.1546	.0117	.09527*
PARENT CONCERN	.1984	.0095	.04748*
INVOL W STUDTS	-.2148	.0095	-.04178*
UNION-MGMT CLIM	.1972	.0107	.04203*
INNOVATION	.1073	.0120	.03954*
SEX	.7715	.0098	.05516*
WORK LOAD	.0317	.0097	-.04106*
SHARE D.M.	.0634	.0119	.04899*
SALARY	.3614	.0113	.06359*
TOTAL YEARS EXP.	-.0922	.0110	-.04027*
SUPERVISION	.1890	.0097	.03494*
PERSTUDAA	.1870	.0103	.02618*

Multiple R	.78906
R Square	.62261
Adjusted R	.62111

Analysis of Variance:

	Df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	17	133335.81	7843.28
Residual	4271	80819.31	18.92

F = 414.488 Sig F = .0000

*Significant at p<.0015